

REMARKS

Applicants note with appreciation that, in the Office Action of July 24, 2007, claims 21, 22 and 29-31 were allowed and claims 4-6 and 24 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, claims 18, 19, 23 and 25-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,256,016 B1 (“Piot et al.”). In addition, claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Piot et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Number US 2004/0051798 A1 (“Kakarala et al.”).

In response, Applicants have rewritten the “objected to” claim 4 in independent form by amending the independent claim 1. As a result, claim 4 has been canceled and claim 5 has been amended to maintain proper dependency. Applicants have also rewritten the “objected to” claim 24 in independent form by amending the independent claim 23. As a result, claim 24 has been canceled. Claims 18 and 19 have also been canceled. Furthermore, Applicants have amended the independent claim 25 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited reference of Piot et al. As amended, the independent claim 25 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Piot et al., as explained below. In view of the claim amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 23, and 25-28 be allowed, in addition to the allowed claims 21, 22 and 29-31.

A. Patentability of Amended Independent Claim 25

As amended, the independent claim 25 recites “*wherein the movement computation comprises summing only pixels values from a first one of the digital images, thereby generating a first plurality of sums, and summing only pixel values from a second one of the digital images, thereby generating a second plurality of sums,*” which is not disclosed in the cited reference of Piot et al. Thus, the amended independent claim 25 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Poit et al. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 25 be allowed.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

In rejecting the previously presented independent claim 25, the Office Action states on page 5 that “[t]he calculation uses the formula of $\sum_x \sum_y f(x, y)g(x-m, y-n)$ wherein the variables $\sum_x \sum_y$ imply that the image data signals in the y-direction and the x-direction are summed, i.e. calculation include summing pixel values (see e.g. col. 14, lines 48-63).” However, $f(x, y)$ refers to data signals of a current image and $g(x, y)$ refers to data signals of a reference image. Thus, the formula of $\sum_x \sum_y f(x, y)g(x-m, y-n)$ involves multiplying one of the current image data signals with one of the reference image data signals to derive a first product, where $x=1$ and $y=1$, and then adding the first product to other products derived in a similar manner using other values of x and y . Thus, the formula of $\sum_x \sum_y f(x, y)g(x-m, y-n)$ does not involve summing only pixel values from a particular digital image, but involves summing products of pixel values from two different digital images, i.e., the current image and the reference image. Consequently, the cited reference of Piot et al. does not disclose “*wherein the movement computation comprises summing only pixels values from a first one of the digital images, thereby generating a first plurality of sums, and summing only pixel values from a second one of the digital images, thereby generating a second plurality of sums,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 25. Thus, the amended independent claim 25 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Piot et al. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 25 be allowed.

B. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2, 5, 6 and 26-28

Each of the dependent claims 2, 5, 6 and 26-28 depends on one of the amended independent claims 1 and 25. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Brosnan et al.

Date: October 24, 2007

By: /thomas h. ham/

Thomas H. Ham

Registration No. 43,654

Telephone: (925) 249-1300